

Remarks/Arguments

This application has been carefully considered in connection with the Examiner's Action. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing.

Claims 26-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over GB 2325548 to Nabavi in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,161,182 to Nadooshan, U.S. Patent No. 6,314,425 to Serbinis et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,412,708 to Katz. In response, the Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 26-28 and instead submit that Claims 26-28, as above amended, as well as newly added Claims 60-68 are neither taught nor suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 26-28 and the allowance of Claims 26-28 and 60-68.

Among other teachings, the Examiner cites Nadooshan as disclosing "transmitting access token from the security system server to the remote client" and "providing the security gateway with information about the user and the access token." The Applicants respectfully disagree with certain aspects of the foregoing statements, more specifically, the implication that Nadooshan teaches a system in which the token generating server 300 (equated by the Examiner to Applicants' security system server) directly transmits information about the user and the access token to the access security gateway 145 (equated by the Examiner to Applicants' security gateway). Rather, the protocol illustrated in FIG. 2 clearly and unambiguously indicates that the token generating server 300 never transmits information regarding the user and the access token directly to the access security gateway 145. At best, Nadooshan teaches a system in which the token generating server 300 transmits information to the client 400 which, in turn, uses the provided information to access the remote equipment 140. In contrast, Applicants' invention is directed to a method for remote

monitoring of a premises in which a security system server: (1) transmits an access token to a remote client seeking to access a security gateway; and (2) directly provides the security gateway with information about the user and the access token transmitted to the remote client.

The Examiner cites Katz as teaching “activating a signal at the premises for notifying an occupant at the premises that remote monitoring is occurring.” While neither admitting nor denying the Examiner’s characterization of the teachings of Katz, the Applicants respectfully note that Katz discloses a system in which, upon detecting an emergency condition at a remote scrutiny location L1, terminal V1 of central location Cu may transmit an audible message to the remote scrutiny location L1. In contrast, Applicants’ invention is directed to a method for remote monitoring of a premises in which, rather than originating at a location remote in relation to the security gateway, the security gateway itself generates a notification whenever the security gateway is transmitting data to the remote client. Thus, unlike Katz’s teaching of the generation of an audible signal at a first location, i.e., the central office, upon determining from data transmitted from a second location, i.e., the remote scrutiny location, of the existence of an emergency condition at the second location, the Applicants have invented and claimed a system in which the second location, for example, the security gateway located at the premises, generates an audible signal whenever the security gateway is transferring data to a remote location, for example, the remote client.

It is submitted that the foregoing features patentably distinguish the claimed invention over the cited art and each of the claims pending before the Examiner include the foregoing limitations.


For all the above reasons, the Applicants respectfully consider the withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 26-28 and the allowance of Claims 26-28 and 60-68.

It is believed that no fees are due in connection with this Communication. In the event that fees are due in connection with this Communication, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any fees associated with any of the foregoing papers submitted herewith, or to credit any overpayment thereof, to Deposit Account No. 50-1515, Conley Rose, P.C.

This application is now in condition for allowance. A prompt Notice to that effect is, therefore, earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 28, 2006


Michael S. Bush
Reg. No. 31,745
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

Conley Rose, P.C.
5700 Granite Parkway, Suite 330
Dallas, Texas 75024
(972) 731-2288 (Telephone)
(972) 731-2289 (Facsimile)